

Remarks

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on November 14, 2006, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. It is respectfully submitted that entry of the above amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 in that the amendments (1) place the claims in condition for allowance or, if necessary, in better condition for consideration on appeal; and (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further consideration or search. For the reasons given above, entry of the above claim amendments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

In the present application, independent claims 1, 9, 14, 19, and 22 have been amended and claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to incorporate the features specified in cancelled claim 7 which were indicated as allowable subject matter in the Office Action. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter in the aforementioned claim amendments has previously been presented and thus does not raise new issues or require further consideration and/or search.

Claims 1-3, 5-18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, Jr. et al. (US 6,738,815, hereinafter “Willis”) in view of Profit, Jr. et al. (US 6,636,831, hereinafter “Profit”) in further in view of Devine et al. (US 6,598,167, hereinafter “Devine”) in further in view of Fortier, Jr. et al. (US 2003/0023601, hereinafter “Fortier”). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, Profit, and Devine, in view of Butts et al. (US 6,233,541, hereinafter “Butts”). Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine, in view of Profit, in further view of Willis and Fortier.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5-18, and 22

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-18, and 22 are rejected as being unpatentable over Willis in view of Profit in further in view of Devine in further in view of Fortier. Claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, independent claims 1, 9, 14, and 22 have been amended to incorporate the features in cancelled claim 7 which were indicated as allowable in the Office Action over the cited references of record, Willis, Profit, Devine, and Fortier. Therefore, claims 1, 9, 14, and 22 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 10-13 depend from claim 9 and claims 15-18 depend from claim 14. Thus, these claims specify at least the same features as claims 9 and 14 and thus are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2-3, 5-6, 8, 10-13, and 15-18 should also be withdrawn.

Claim 4

Claim 4 is rejected as being unpatentable over Willis, Profit and Devine, in view of Butts. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 depends from amended independent claim 1 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, amended claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Willis, Profit, and Devine. Therefore, claim 4 is allowable over these references for at least the same reasons. Butts, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Willis, Profit, and Devine, discusses a server and a

web browser terminal for persistent connection to a legacy host system (see col. 1, lines 53-55). Butts however, fails to disclose that communications from a computer are directed from a systems interface to an intranet by a second server sending a command to a first server to direct the computer to a separate network address by bypassing the second server. Based on the foregoing, claim 4 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 19-21

Claims 19-21 are rejected as being unpatentable over Devine, in view of Profit, in further view of Willis and Fortier. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 19 specifies similar features as amended independent claims 1, 9, 14, and 22, which, as discussed above, are allowable over the combination of Willis, Profit, Devine, and Fortier. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 19 is also for at least the same reasons and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 20-21 depend from claim 19. Thus, these claims specify at least the same features as claim 19 and thus are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 20-21 should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

No additional fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Date: January 5, 2007

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(678) 565-4748

Respectfully submitted,

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299